

REMARKS

Upon entry of the instant amendment, claims 1-2, 4, 7-9 and 13-15 and 18-22 will remain pending in the instant application. Support for the amendments made to claim 1 can be found in the specification at page 11, lines 3-6 and in original claims 3 and 17, which are now cancelled to prevent a redundancy with amended claim 1. No new matter is being introduced by the present amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-4, 8-9, 13-15 and 17-22 have been rejected under the provisions of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Reconsideration and withdraw of this rejection is respectfully requested based on the amendment made herein to claim 1 and the following considerations.

Claim 1 has been amended to positively recite "*wherein the organic solvent has a small polarity and an electrical resistivity of not lower than $10^9 \Omega \cdot \text{cm}$* ". In the office action, at page 2, paragraph "3.", the USPTO notes that the specification is enabling for "organic solvent that is small in polarity and has electrical resistivity of not lower than $10^9 \Omega \cdot \text{cm}$ ". As such withdraw of the above rejection is required at present.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-4, 8-9, 13-15 and 18-22 have been rejected under the provisions of 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ikeda et al (US 5, 952,429). Reconsideration of this rejection is requested based on the amendment made herein to claim 1 and the following considerations.

Claim 1 has been instantly amended to recited limitations previously recited in claim 17 (now cancelled). Because the Examiner did not previously reject claim 17 over the cited art of Ikeda et al. US '429 under the provisions of 35 USC § 102(b), it follows that the above rejection has been overcome by the instant amendment of claim 1.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-2, 4, 7-9, 13-15 and 17-20 and 22 have been rejected under the provisions of 35 USC § 103(a) as being rendered obvious by Tsubuko et al (US 5,952,048) in view of Ryntz et al. (US 4,673,718). Reconsideration of this rejection is requested based on the amendment made herein to claim 1 and the following considerations.

Claim 1 has been instantly amended to recited limitations previously recited in claim 3 (now cancelled). Because the Examiner did not previously reject claim 3 over the cited art of Tsubuko et

al. US '048 in view of Ryntz et al. US '718 under the provisions of 35 USC § 103(a), it follows that the above rejection has been overcome by the instant amendment of claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Based on the amendments and remarks presented herein, the Examiner is respectfully requested to issue a notice of allowance indicating that each of the pending claims 1-2, 4, 7-9 and 13-15 and 18-22 are now allowed.


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John W. Bailey (Reg. No. 32,881) at the telephone number below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Appl. No. 09/820,313

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
John W. Bailey, #32,881

JWB/enm/jwb
0152-0555P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000